DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 819 EC 140 333

AUTHOR Zeigler, Carmen S., Comp.; And Others
TITLE A Pilot Document of Standards and Procedures Developed to Assist the Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team in the Identification of Learning Disabilities.
INSTITUTION Bloomfield Hills School District, Mich.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children (59th, New York, NY, April 12-17, 1981, Session F-92).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Definitions; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicap Identification; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Learning Disabilities; State Programs; *Student Evaluation; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS Michigan (Bloomfield Hills)

ABSTRACT

Designed by the Bloomfield Hills (Michigan) multidisciplinary evaluation team, the document suggests procedures and enabling activities to implement the assessment and identification of learning disabled students. Individual sections address five areas (ability, achievement, severe discrepancy, exclusionary clause, and need for special education services) in terms of definitions, discussion, and suggested procedures/ measures for assessment. Following a bibliography (with references on ability, adaptive behavior scales, and achievement) are appended materials which include Michigan special education rules for learning disability, inter/intra test analysis, definitions, standard score conversions, examples of the formula for determing the severe discrepancy level, a general education intervention form, a multidisciplinary evaluation team summary report, and a summary of implementation procedures. (SB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209819

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A PILOT DOCUMENT OF STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES DEVELOPED TO ASSIST THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY EVALUATION TEAM IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF LEARNING DISABILITIES

BLOOMFIELD HILLS SCHOOLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carmen L. Zeigler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

July, 1980

EC140333

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction..... i
ii

Section I - Ability Level..... 1

Section II - Achievement..... 4

Section III - Severe Discrepancy..... 9

Section IV - Exclusionary Clause..... 12

Section V - Determining if Special Education Services Are Needed..... 15

Section VI - Documentation..... 18

Bibliography..... 19

Appendix - L.D. Rule..... 1

Inter/Intra Test Analysis..... 2

Definitions..... 6

Standard Score Conversions..... 8

Examples of Formula..... 9

General Education Intervention Form... 11

M.E.T. Summary Report..... 12

Summary of Implementation Procedures.. 13

INTRODUCTION

Recently the State Board of Education adopted the Federal definition of Learning Disabilities from P.L. 94-142 for inclusion into the State Rules and Regulations. During the summer of 1979 the Special Education Service Area from the State requested a team from every Intermediate School District to participate in an L.D. Institute. The purpose of the Institute was to suggest procedures and enabling activities to comprehensively and consistently implement the assessment and identification of learning disabled students. The Oakland County Intermediate School District selected a team from the Bloomfield Hills School District made up of a Supervisor of Special Education, a school psychologist, an L.R.C. teacher and a special education teacher consultant to attend this institute.

Twenty-two teams participated in the Institute by responding to an initial document, piloting proposed procedures and generating a final draft of a document. This document will be distributed statewide during the Fall of 1980.

In addition, the Bloomfield Hills Team responded to a request from Central Administration to refine and adapt the State document for use within the local district. The following document is a result of that request.

The standards and procedures outlined in the Bloomfield Hills document will be implemented by special education staff during the 80-81 school year with monitoring and data collection managed by a building administrator.

Central to the issue of implementation is the multidisciplinary evaluation team which, at a minimum, consists of the classroom teacher and at least one person qualified to conduct individual diagnostic evaluations. The Bloomfield Hills multidisciplinary evaluation team will at a minimum include a school psychologist, a classroom teacher and a teacher certified in the area of learning disabilities. Other members may be added as needed. Each member of this team has equal responsibility in the assessment and decision making process.

A major concept implicit in this document is that each of the five areas; ability, achievement, severe discrepancy, exclusionary clause and need for special education services, must be considered in the determination of a learning disability.

INTRODUCTION (con't)

The Bloomfield Hills document has been divided into 6 sections, each corresponding to a specific area that the multidisciplinary team must address.

A Checklist Summary Sheet has been designed to serve as documentation that all areas have been addressed. This checklist and written multidisciplinary evaluation team reports will be submitted at the I.E.P.C. and become a part of the student's cumulative file.

This document to be used by Bloomfield Hills Schools is an initial step; use of it throughout the coming year will generate data as to its effectiveness and applicability.

Compiled and submitted by:

Joann C. Brooks, Teacher Consultant
Arlene Robertson, School Psychologist
Jean Rokas, Teacher Consultant
Carmen S. Zeigler, Supervisor of Special Education

S E C T I O N I

ABILITY LEVEL

Definition:

Ability is defined as one's general capacity to adapt to and function in the learning environment. Ability level, therefore, includes cognitive/intellectual abilities and adaptive behaviors as displayed in school, home and in social relationships.

Discussion:

The goal of assessment is to acquire a reasonable representation of an individual's wide range of cognitive and adaptive abilities.

It is important to assess areas such as social competence, verbal thought, nonverbal thought, academic achievement, fund of general knowledge, adaptive behavior and abstract reasoning.

A variety of formal and informal procedures may be employed to obtain an indication of cognitive and adaptive ability. These include intelligence tests (with intra/inter test analysis) and observations. It is not always necessary, however, to use all of the procedures indicated in this section. The multidisciplinary team is responsible for determining and documenting that a reasonable assessment has been completed.

The use of an individually administered intelligence test is required with students suspected of being learning disabled because such tests provide more definitive and valid information regarding intellectual ability. However, the global IQ scores obtained from such instruments are not to be blindly accepted as a student's ability level without additional collaborative information from other sources. The degree and amount of other information needed to establish a student's ability level are determined by the multidisciplinary team and/or educational planning committee, and should depend upon the characteristics of the student under consideration. It is,therefore,recommended that the determination of ability be based on procedures which:

1. Consider the influences of social, cultural, and educational factors on the performance on tests and subtests.

ABILITY LEVEL

2. Regroup subtests of tests in specified ways to analyze, more carefully, intellectual strengths and weaknessess.

3. Support and verify test results through the use of additional formal and informal test and observation procedures.

The following areas should be considered when determining a student's ability level.

I. Procedure

A. General Intelligence Tests

Suggestions	Primarily Obtained by:
WPPSI WISC-R WAIS Stanford-Binet McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities	Psychologist

Suggested Intra/Inter Test Analyses are*:

Kaufman's Procedures
Bannatyne's Categorizations
Sattler's Analyses

B. Developmental, Social and Educational Histories

Suggestions	
Bloomfield Hills Intake Form Review of CA-60 Private Resources	Social Worker, Special Education Teacher/ Teacher-Consultant, Classroom Teacher, Counselor/Supervisor

* Description in appendix. Pages 2-5

ABILITY LEVEL

C. Adaptive Behavior Scales

Suggestions	Primarily Obtained by:
Vineland Social Maturity Scale AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale: Public School version Balthazar Scales of Adaptive Behavior Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part III: Tests of Interest Level)	Special Education Teacher/ Teacher-Consultant, Social Worker, Classroom Teacher, Parent

D. Observations

Suggestions	
Social Competence Behavioral Patterns Learning Style	Social Worker, Classroom Teacher, Special Education Teacher/Teacher-Consultant, Parent

S E C T I O N II

ACHIEVEMENT

Definition:

Achievement is defined as the student's skill development in academic content areas.

Discussion:

This section defines and discusses procedures for the evaluation of the seven achievement areas outlined in the federal rules and regulations for learning disabilities. These are: Oral Expression; Listening Comprehension; Basic Reading Skill; Reading Comprehension; Written Expression; Mathematics Calculation; and Mathematics Reasoning.

Tests and procedures vary with respect to the adequacy of their standardization, validity, and reliability. The diagnostic personnel will need to determine which instruments are appropriate, depending upon their needs and preferences (Salvia, Ysseldyke, 1978). Informal as well as formal instruments may be of value when evaluating achievement. However, it is recommended that formal evaluation instruments be used as a base for the initial determination of specific learning disabilities. It is also recommended that formal tests be employed which provide standard scores or percentile ranks to allow a comparison of the student's ability and achievement levels.

Information regarding achievement level from informal tests and other sources (e.g. teacher information, work samples, etc.) should be viewed as being supplementary. It is recommended that individually administered tests be used to evaluate achievement level of suspected learning disabled students.

It is not always essential to evaluate formally all seven areas of achievement. While it is important that the educational planning committee has adequate information on all seven areas, formalized test information is not always required. If, for example, there is adequate teacher information (work samples and grades) that a student is performing well in mathematics, it is not essential that mathematics be evaluated formally. Whenever there is uncertainty regarding achievement in an area, formal testing procedures should be employed for that area.

ACHIEVEMENT

Each of the seven areas has component parts. The separate analysis of the components may permit a more precise examination of the achievement area. However, it must be remembered that a weakness in a single component may not constitute a deficit in that general area of achievement.

Seven Areas Defined

1. Oral Expression

Oral expression is the ability to express oneself verbally. It includes utilization of the phonological, morphological, syntactical, and semantic aspects of the language system.*

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Articulation	Speech & Language Therapists, Special Education Teacher/ Teacher-Consultant
Oral-Motor Examination	
Carrow Elicited Language Inventory	
Mean Length of Response**)	
Mean Sentence Length**)	Determined through language sample.
Mean Length of Utterance**)	
Utah Test of Language Development	
Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part II: Tests of Achievement)	
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (General Information)	
Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude (Subtests 8,10,15)	
Kent E.G.Y. Scale	

2. Listening Comprehension

Listening Comprehension is the ability to receive and to understand spoken utterances. It includes utilization of the phonological, morphological, syntactical, and semantic aspects of the language system.*

* Appendix pg. 6

** Appendix pg. 7

ACHIEVEMENT

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Tests Auditory Figure-Ground Auditory Memory Sound/Symbol Relationships Auditory Discrimination Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Slingerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities Test for the Auditory Comprehension of Language Lindamood Auditory Concept Assessment of Children's Language Comprehension The Flowers-Costello Test of Central Auditory Ability Short Term Auditory Retrival and Storage Test Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test Informal Listening Inventories Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part I: Tests of Cognitive Ability)	Speech & Language Therapists, Special Education Teacher/Teacher-Consultant, Psychologists

3. Basic Reading Skill

Reading is the ability to extract information from texts (Gibson & Levin 1978). It consists of several processes, skills, and strategies. Some traditional indicators of basic reading skill are:

A. Sight word vocabulary - identifying words from memory by their configuration.

B. Phonic analysis - identifying words by using sound-symbol relationships and structural analysis.

C. Reading rate - reading speed and fluency.

Both sight word knowledge and phonic analysis are affected by reading words in context rather than in isolation. The use of syntactic and semantic clues assist the reader in word identification, but the impact will be mainly in the area of comprehension.

ACHIEVEMENT

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
Brigance Diagnostic Inventories Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part I: Tests of Cognitive Ability, Part II: Tests of Achievement) Informal Reading Inventories Miscue Analysis Gray Oral Reading Test	Classroom Teacher, Special Education Teacher/Teacher-Consultant

4. Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension, both oral and silent, is the process by which the meaning intended by the author is understood and confirmed by the reader. This includes understanding at various levels, such as literal and inferential.

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
Brigance Diagnostic Inventories Mastery and Placement Tests from Basal Series Informal Reading Inventories Stanford Diagnostic Reading Tests Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part I: Tests of Cognitive Ability, Part II: Tests of Achievement)	Classroom Teacher, Special Education Teacher/Teacher-Consultant

5. Written Expression

Written expression is the ability to employ a visual symbol system to express thoughts, feelings and ideas in a meaningful manner. This includes the following abilities: Mechanical (legible symbol formation); Productive (adequate expression of thoughts, opinions and feelings); Conventional (compliance with standards of style); Linguistic (acceptable grammar); Cognitive (creative expression).

ACHIEVEMENT

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
Beery-Buktenica Test of Visual Motor Integration Slingerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Specific Language Disability Informal Spelling Tests Brigance Diagnostic Inventories Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part I: Tests of Cognitive Ability) Bloomfield Hills Writing Program	Psychologist, Special Education Teacher/ Teacher-Consultant, Classroom Teacher

6. Mathematics Calculation

Mathematics calculation is the ability to provide a written or oral solution to arithmetical tasks. This includes working in the basic operations with a variety of content.

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
Brigance Diagnostic Inventories Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test Bloomfield Hills Criterion Referenced Math Objectives Stanford Diagnostic Math Tests Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part II: Tests of Achievement)	Special Education Teacher/ Teacher-Consultant,

7. Mathematics Reasoning

Mathematics reasoning is the ability to apply mathematical facts and concepts to the solution of mathematical problems. This includes considering mathematical facts and concepts, calculating the solution and applying the solution.

Suggested Instruments	Primarily Obtained by:
KeyMath Diagnostic Test Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Part I: Tests of Cognitive Ability, Part II: Tests of Achievement)	Special Education Teacher/ Teacher-Consultant, Classroom Teacher

S E C T I O N III

SEVERE DISCREPANCY

Definition

Severe discrepancy as identified in the Michigan Special Education Rules is a difference between achievement and intellectual ability in one or more of the seven learning areas which cannot be primarily a result of any of the following:

a) A visual, hearing or motor handicap
b) Mental Retardation
c) Emotional Disturbance
d) Environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage

Discussion:

A severe discrepancy exists when there is a significant difference between what the student has actually learned and what the student is potentially capable of learning, as determined by statistically reliable tests.

The question therefore, is: What amount of discrepancy between achievement and potential should be considered severe? In spite of the difficulties raised by this question, it is necessary for the team to make decisions using the quantitative data that are available (Lerner, 1976). It is recognized that test data are imperfect, however, the child with a learning disability cannot wait until diagnostic tools are without fault. Test and observational data are subject to fallibility and it is important for those involved in evaluation to know the limitations of each test. Test information must be cautiously interpreted.

It should be kept in mind that the establishment of a severe discrepancy, by itself, is not sufficient to certify a student "learning disabled". Other factors in the L.D. definition must also be considered (e.g. is the problem primarily a problem of sensory impairment, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage; has the youngster had appropriate educational opportunity; are special education programs and services necessary to correct the discrepancy?)

The multidisciplinary team may determine that a severe discrepency does exist in cases where the difference between ability and achievement is not significant enough to meet the criteria discussed in this section.

SEVERE DISCREPANCY

Clearly the intent of the regulations is to insure that each child is measured against his/her own expected performance and not against some arbitrary general standard. The M.E.T. needs to include in their report an explanation of why a severe discrepancy exists.

The literature suggests numerous methods for determining severe discrepancy. In the interest of avoiding simplistic approaches and formulas which discriminate against students who function at upper and lower ends of the scale, note the following two alternatives:

1. The student's ability and achievement are compared through the use of Standard Scores.

Discussion:

To the degree possible, the educational planning committee should try to obtain a fairly accurate idea of whether a discrepancy between ability level and achievement is the result of chance, or a true difference between scores.

A sound system of comparing ability level and achievement must be based on equal measurement units such as Standard Scores. Standard scores are a set of scores that transform raw scores in such a way that the set of scores always has the same mean and the same standard deviation. One cannot compare achievement and aptitude based on scales that lack equal units of measurment such as age equivalent, grade equivalent and percentile ranks. Percentile scores can easily be converted into Standard Scores. (See Table I)*

It is not always possible to obtain a Standard Score because the data available may be reported in some other form such as age equivalents. In these cases an estimate of achievement range can be made and this can be compared to ability.

The following guidelines for comparing Standard Scores for ability and achievement levels will be used:

a. If the difference is less than eight (8) standard score points, the probability is low that the scores are significantly different.

* See Appendix page 8

b. If the difference is between eight (8) and fifteen (15) standard score points, the probability is fair that the scores are significantly different.

c. If the difference is greater than fifteen (15) standard score points, the probability is high that the scores are significantly different.

2. The student performs at or below 50% of his/her expected achievement level when intellectual ability, age and previous educational experiences are considered. (US)E, 1976, pg. 52407)

Discussion:

While the original U.S.O.E. formula has disappeared, a measure of significant difference between expected and actual achievement is needed to implement the identification procedure required by law. If a discrepancy is necessary, it is appropriate to use what is considered to be the best alternative for measuring it. (Algozzine, et al. 1979)

Research has indicated that the following formula may be useful in obtaining 50% discrepancy levels at various IQ and CA levels:

Severe Discrepancy Level (SDL)

$$SDL = .5\left[\left(\frac{IQ}{100}\right) X (C.A. - 5.5)\right]$$

This formula takes into account the fact that IQ is thought to influence learning rate and that chronological age minus average entry age may be the best estimate of expected grade placement. The formula "weights" the expected grade placement by the IQ and thereby provides an appropriate indicator against which the discrepancy level should be calculated. Refer to appendix for examples of calculating the formula.*

*See Appendix pages 9 and 10

S E C T I O N IV

EXCLUSIONARY CLAUSE

Definition:

Section 121a541(b) P.L. 94-142

The team may not identify a child as having a specific learning disability if the severe discrepancy between ability and achievement is primarily the result of: 1) a visual, hearing or motor handicap; 2) mental retardation; 3) emotional disturbance; 4) environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.

Discussion:

Not all children who demonstrate a severe discrepancy between ability and achievement in one or more of the seven areas outlined above need be identified as learning disabled. It is quite possible that a learner's performance and production in the school setting are not equal to his or her ability level for reasons beyond the learning environment.

The determination of learning disabilities must be established on the premise that the disorder underlying the severe discrepancy is related to a constitutional factor or group of factors within the individual learner, and is not primarily linked to other factors.

Enabling Procedures

In order to guarantee that a learner receives appropriate education services for the learning disabled, the multidisciplinary team must present evidence that the student's severe discrepancy is not related to any one of the four areas identified. It is the responsibility of the team to decide which areas, if any, warrant further investigation and to facilitate such examinations. In difficult cases, it is quite possible that all four areas will need to be thoroughly examined.

Listed below are suggested enabling procedures which may be used to support the team's decision.

1. Sensory Impairments/Motor Handicaps

   Ophthalmologic/Optometric Examination
   Otolaryngologic Examination
   Audiologic Examination

EXCLUSIONARY CLAUSE

Neurological Assessment
Orthopedic/Physical Therapist Assessment
Review of Medical and Educational History

2. Mental Retardation

Assessment of Cognitive Ability
Assessment of Adaptive Behavior
Classroom Observations by Psychologist or T.C./M.I.
Analysis of Classroom Performance
Review of Educational History

3. Emotional Disturbance

a. Evaluations

Psychological Assessment (cognitive)
Psychological Assessment (projective)
Psychiatric Assessment
Social Worker Report
Complete Social History: Child/Family
Educational History: Child/Teacher/School

b. Observations

Data-based Classroom Observations
Teacher Anecdotal History
Free-time/Free-play Observations
Home Visitation
Individual Student and Teacher Interaction

c. Supplemental Information

Private Agencies
Parent Interview

4. Enviromental/Cultural/ or Economic Disadvantage

a. School-related Considerations*

Determination of attendance patterns for previous three years of school (e.g., irregular attendance)
Profile of school and district socio-economic status

* All information to be secured within confines of Family Rights Privacy Act provisions

EXCLUSIONARY CLAUSE

b. Family-related Considerations*

Social history by Social Worker
Performance profile of siblings in school
Reports from Community Service Agencies
Documentation of signigicant family events
(e.g. disruptive family situation)

c. Cultural/Economic Considerations*

Bilingual/Bicultural background
Assessment of influence of language and/or
dialect on performance in school setting

*All information to be secured within confines of Family Rights Privacy Act provisions.

S E C T I O N V

DETERMINING IF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES ARE NEEDED

INTRODUCTION:

A student can be identified as being learning disabled only when he/she has been provided with learning alternatives that are appropriate to his/her age and ability levels in general education. It is assumed by the writers of this document that a student achieving at grade level does not need special education for the learning disabled.

Discussion:

During the past few years, it has become more commonplace for students with problems in behavior and learning to be referred to the special education service areas of local school systems. In a majority of cases, the eventual special education program was the best possible provision of educational services. In some instances, however, a special education program was inappropriate; the student should have been afforded more flexible alternatives for learning within the general education programs of the school system.

With the promulgation of P.L. 94-142 in 1975, additional responsibility was placed on the multidisciplinary evaluation team to document carefully the need for specialized services. Realistically, this directive in the law sought to have school systems guarantee that appropriate available alternatives had been tried within the student's educational program before any further determination about the existence of a specific disability.

The areas listed below should be addressed by the team when reviewing learning experiences in general education.

A. Methods, Materials and Settings
B. Specialized Assistance in the Classroom
C. Specialized Programs (non-special education)

DETERMINING IF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES ARE NEEDED

Examples of accepted procedures for each of the 3 areas are:

Methods

Change in reading program, reading book and/or reading approach
Change in math program or math book
Change in spelling program or spelling book
Oral instead of written instruction
Behavior modification (positive and negative reinforcement)
Contracts and Assignment Sheets

Materials

Special paper
Tape recorder, typewriter, calculator
Pencil grip
Supplementary texts
Other

Setting

Carrel
Change in instructional grouping
Individual time with teacher
Other

Specialized Assistance in the Classroom

Peer, parent or cross-age tutoring
Teacher Consultant for 10 day evaluation
Consultation with support services
Diagnostic Teaching
Other

Specialized Programs and Services

Occupational and/or Physical Therapy
Oakland Schools Referral
Modified schedule by Building Instructional Team (B.I.T.)
Shared time (Student participates in small group activities directed by a special education teacher)

DETERMINING IF SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES ARE NEEDED

Specialized Programs (con't)

Speech and Language
Work Study
Private Agencies
Other

Documentation

Special Education form #215 will be used by the B.I.T. to document alternatives and to provide evidence to the multidisciplinary evaluation team that general education alternatives have been tried.*

Acceptable standards indicate that three or more interventions should be planned and implemented. The effectiveness of general education interventions will be based on a 3-4 week trial period.

* See Appendix for a Sample of this form, page 11

SECTION VI

"It is necessary to present documentation at the I.E.P.C. meeting to support adherence to all aspects of the regulations."

Procedure

1. The Checklist Summary Sheet to be used as part of multidisciplinary evaluation team report presented at the I.E.P.C. is attached. (Form #220a)*

2. Reports from each member of the multidisciplinary team participating in the evaluation of the student must be attached to the Checklist Summary Sheet.

3. The Checklist Summary Sheet and the reports of the multidisplinary team must be attached to the I.E.P.C. form. The original is placed in the cummulative file and an additional copy provided to parents.

An outline of implementation procedures as they might reflect team processing of a referral for a student suspected of being learning disabled can be found in the Appendix, pages 13 and 14.

*See Appendix page 12

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REFERENCES

Algozzine, Bob., Charles Forgone, Cecil D. Mercer, and John Trifiletti. "Toward Defining Discrepancies for Specific Learning Disabilities: An Analysis and Alernatives." Learning Disability Quarterly, vol. 21, No. 4, (Fall 1979), pp. 25-31.

Bannatyne, A. Language, Reading and Learning Disabilities. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Gibson, Eleanor J. and Harry Levin. The Psychology of Reading. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1975.

Hanna, G. S., N. J. Dyck and M. C. Holen. "Objective Analysis of Achievement Aptitude Discrepancies in L. D. Classification." Learning Disability Quarterly, 1979, 2 (4), 32-38 (b).

Kaufman, A. S. Intelligent Testing with the WISC-R. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1979.

Lerner, Janet W. Children with Learning Disabilities, 2nd ed. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton-Mifflin, 1976.

Salvia, J. and J. E. Ysselyke. Assessment in Special and Remedial Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1978.

Sattler, J. M. Assessment of Children's Intelligence. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1974.

ABILITY

Binet, Alfred. Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. Form L-M (Revised). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1972.

McCarthy, D. Manual for the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1972.

Wechsler, D. Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. (WAIS) New York: The Psychological Corporation, Division of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 304 East 45th St, New York, N. Y. 10017.

----------. Manual for the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intellegence. (WPPSI) 1967 New York: The Psychological Corporation, Division of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 304 East 45th St, New York, N. Y. 10017.

----------. Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised. (WISC-R) 1974 New York: The Psychological Corporation, Division of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 304 East 45th St, New York, N. Y. 10017.

ADAPTIVE BEHAVIOR SCALES

AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale. Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Deficiency. 1929.

AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale-Public School Version (1974 Revision). Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Deficiency, 1975.

Balthazar Scales of Adaptive Behavior. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Vineland Social Maturity Scale. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service, 1965. (Originally published Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1953).

Woodcock-Johnson Psych-Educational Battery (Part III Tests of Interest Level) Itingham, MA: Teaching Resources 1977.

ACHIEVEMENT

Beery-Buktenica Test of Visual-Motor Integration. Follett Publishing Company, Chicago, IL: 1967.

Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test for Children. Western Psychological Services, Los Amgeles, CA: 1962.

Brigance Diagnostic Inventories. North Billerica, MA: Curriculm Associates, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980.

Carrow Elicited Language Inventory. Austin, TX: Learning Concepts, 1974

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1955.

Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Articulation. Circle Pines, MN. American Guidance Service, Inc., 1969.

Gray Oral Reading Test. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test. American Guidance Service, Inc. Circle Pines MN: 1971.

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service, 1959.

Porch Index of Communicative Abilities in Children. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1974.

Slingerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities. Educators Publishing Service, 1962.

ACHIEVEMENT

Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test. American Guidance Service, Inc. Circle Pines, MN: 1971.

Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. New York, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich: 1977.

Token Test for Children. Itingham, MA: Teaching Resources.

Utah Test of Language Developmental. Salt Lake City, UT: Communication Research Associates, 1967.

Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test. Los Angeles: Western Psychological ervices, 1973.

Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educaitonal Battery. Itinghan, MA: Teaching Resources, 1977.

APPENDIX

MICHIGAN SPECIAL EDUCATION RULES
PA 451 1980
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

R. 340.1713 "Specific learning disability" defined; determination.

(1) "Specific learning disability" means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations. The term includes such conditions as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain disfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. The term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor handicaps, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

(2) The individualized educational planning committee may determine that a child has a specific learning disability if the child does not achieve commensurate with his or her age and ability levels in 1 or more of the areas listed in this subrule, when provided with learning experiences appropriate for the child's age and ability levels, and if the multidisciplinary evaluation team finds that a child has a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability in 1 or more of the following areas:

(a) Oral expression.
(b) Listening comprehension.
(c) Written expression.
(d) Basic reading skill.
(e) Reading comprehension.
(f) Mathematics calculation.
(g) Mathematics reasoning.

(3) The individualized educational planning committee may not identify a child as having a specific learning disability if the severe discrepancy between ability and achievement is primarily the result of any of the following:

(a) A visual, hearing, or motor handicap.
(b) Mental retardation.
(c) Emotional disturbance.
(d) Environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.

(4) A determination of impairment shall be based upon a comprehensive evaluation by a multidisciplinary evaluation team which shall include at least both of the following:

(a) A regular classroom teacher qualified to teach a child of his or her age or, for a child of less than school age, an individual qualified by the state educational agency to teach a child of his or her age.

(b) At least 1 person qualified to conduct individual diagnostic examinations of children, such as a school psychologist, a teacher of the speech and language impaired, or a teacher consultant.

INTER/INTRA-TEST ANALYSIS

Since many learning disabled students display major discrepancies and variations in their cognitive performance, it is frequently benficial to analyze one's performance on an individually administered intelligence test. By carefully analyzing and grouping subtest scores, one often obtains a clearer indication of a learning disabled student's cognitive strengths and weaknesses, and hence a more valid appraisal of his/her ability level. Some of the more frequently used analysis procedures are discussed in this section.

Kaufman's Procedures. As a result of factor analytic study of data from the standardization sample of the WISC-R, Kaufman (1979) identified the three factors, tabulated as follows:

Verbal Comprehension	Perceptual Organization	Freedom from Distractibility
Information	Picture Completion	Arithmetic
Similarities	Picture Arrangement	Digit Span
Vocabulary	Block Design	Coding
Comprehension	Object Assembly	
	Mazes	

In some cases, particularly with learning disabled students (Blaha & Vance, 1979), this categorization may characterize the cognitive abilities of students in a more valid manner than the typical Verbal IQ-Performance IQ dichotomy. Sobotka and Black (1978) describe a procedure for rapidly converting the summed factor scores into standard IQ scores. This permits the direct comparison of the factors to each other and to the Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale IQ scores.

The Verbal Comprehension factor would appear to measure one's ability to comprehend, conceptualize, and express verbal information, as well as to verbally retain knowledge (exclusive of arithmetic skills). The Perceptual Organization factor would appear to predominantly measure one's ability to conceptualize and abstract nonverbal information. Thus, these two factors would appear to provide a fairly good representation of one's verbal and nonverbal cognitive performance.

In contrast to the two cognitive factors, the Freedom from Distractibility cluster would appear to primarily be a measure of behavioral attributes. Therefore, it is often felt to measure one's ability to selectively attend and concentrate on tasks. It may also be a measure of test anxiety. However, while it is quite easy to see how a student may score very poorly on the three subtests constituting this factor because of distractible behavior or test anxiety, it is more difficult to conceive of students performing very well on the three measures. Some cognitive abilities that must be considered during the interpretation process are: numerical skills, sequencing skills, memory skills,auditory reorganization abilities, fine motor skills, rapid learning propensities, and the like.

Kaufman's book also provides invaluable data for interpreting the significance of subtest scatter and verbal-performance IQ discrepancies. He also outlines a process for thoughtfully analyzing the scores obtained from the WISC-R. Essentially, the procedures provide a step-by-step process in which a better understanding of an individual's intellectual processes can be made when his/her scores do not resemble the Verbal and Performance Scales of the WISC-R.

Bannatyne's Categorizations. Bannatyne (1971, pp. 591-592) has suggested a recategorization of the subtests from the WISC which is also applicable for use with the WISC-R. It is a slight variant to Kaufman's factor structure which often provides additional information regarding a youngster's cognitive performance. Bannatyne recommends the division of the subtests into these categories:

Verbal Conceptualization Ability	Spatial Ability	Sequencing Ability	Acquired Knowledge
Comprehension	Picture Completion	Arithmetic	Information
Similarities	Block Design	Digit Span	Arithmetic
Vocabulary	Object Assembly	Coding	Vocabulary

He defines the categories as follows:

1. Verbal conceptualizing ability - ability to manipulate and develop concepts; strong reliance on language - cognitive skills.

2. Spatial ability - ability to manipulate objects directly or symbolically in multi-dimensional space, without sequencing.

3. Sequencing ability - ability to retain sequences of auditory and visual stimuli in short term memory storage; attentional processes are also involved.

4. Acquired knowledge - estimate of educational attainment.

Sattler's Analysis. Sattler (1974, pp. 134-146) has presented a classification scheme of the 1960 Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale which "...is offered as a means of ordering data from the Stanford-Binet and as a convenient way of describing what the child has done in categories that have some validity"(p. 134). The scheme is not to be used to determine special abilities, but rather it is

intended to assist in making interpretations; apparent strengths and weaknesses need to be substantiated by further testing. Sattler's seven categories are as follows:

1. Language. This category includes tests related to maturity of vocabulary (in relation to the prekindergarten level), extent of vocabulary (referring to the number of words the child can define), quality of vocabulary (measured by such tests as abstract words, rhymes, word naming, and definitions), and comprehension of verbal relations.

2. Memory. This category contains meaningful, nonmeaningful, and visual memory tests. The tests are considered to reflect rote auditory memory, ideational memory, and attention span,

3. Conceptual Thinking. This category, while closely associated with language ability, is primarily concerned with abstract thinking. Such functions as generalization, assuming an "as if" attitude are subsumed.

4. Reasoning. This category contains verbal and nonverbal reasoning tests. The verbal absurity tests are the prototype for the verbal reasoning tests. The pictorial and orientation problems represent perception of logical relations, discrimination ability, and analysis and syntheses. Spatial reasoning may also be measured by the orientation tests.

5. Numerical Reasoning. This category includes tests involving arithmetic reasoning problems. The content is closely related to school learning. Numerical reasoning involves concentration and the ability to generalize from numerical data.

6. Visual-Motor. This category contains tests concerned with manual dexterity, eye-hand coordination, and perception of spatial relations. Constructive visual imagery may be involved in the paper folding test. Nonverbal reasoning ability may be involved in some of the visual-motor tests.

7. Social Intelligence. This category strongly overlaps with the reasoning category, so that consideration should be given to the tests classified in the latter as also reflecting social comprehension. Social intelligence includes social maturity and social judgment. The comprehension and finding reasons tests are seen to reflect social judgment, whereas obeying simple commands, response to pictures, and comparison tests likely reflect social maturity. (p. 135)

In his book, Sattler indentifies the subtests from the Stanford-Binet which are associated with each category. He also presents a "Binegram" while provides a graphic, visual picture of an individual's strengths and weaknesses on the Stanford-Binet. Finally, Sattler describes his "standard deviation method" which is used to facilitate analysis of one's performance on the scale. The procedure permits one to use chronological age and/or mental age as a reference point for analyzing a student's pattern of performance.

DEFINITIONS

Oral Expression

Phonology- producing the phonemes (speech sounds) of a language according to the rules which dictate their combination.

Morphology- producing the morphemes (smallest meaningful spoken units having a differential function) of a language according to the rules which dictate their combination.

Syntax- employing the rules which dictate the sequence, combination, and function of words in an acceptable spoken sentence.

Semantics- producing spoken utterances which are relevant and meaningful in a given communication context.

Listening Comprehension

Phonology- auditorily discriminating the phonemes (speech sounds) of a language according to the rules which dictate their combination.

Morphology- understanding the morphemes (smallest meaningful spoken units having a differential function) of a language when these are produced by a talker according to the rules which dictate their combination.

Syntax- understanding the sentences of a talker when these are produced according to an acceptable sequence, combination and function of words.

Semantics- understanding any spoken utterance of a talker which is relevant and meaningful to a given communication context.

DEFINITIONS

Mean Length of Response- Average number of words used in number of separate utterances.

Mean Sentence Length- Average number of words used in a sentence.

Mean Length of Utterance- Average number of morphemes used per utterance.

TABLE I*

NORMALIZED STANDARD SCORE
CONVERSIONS FROM PERCENTILE RANKS

Percentile Rank	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Standard Score
99	135	66	106	33	93
98	131	65	106	32	93
97	128	64	105	31	93
96	126	63	105	30	92
95	125	62	105	29	92
94	123	61	104	28	91
93	122	60	104	27	91
92	121	59	103	26	90
91	120	58	103	25	90
90	119	57	103	24	89
89	118	56	102	23	89
88	118	55	102	22	88
87	117	54	102	21	88
86	116	53	101	20	87
85	116	52	101	19	87
84	115	51	100	18	86
83	114	50	100	17	86
82	114	49	100	16	85
81	113	48	99	15	84
80	113	47	99	14	84
79	112	46	98	13	83
78	112	45	98	12	82
77	111	44	98	11	82
76	111	43	97	10	81
75	110	42	97	9	80
74	110	41	97	8	79
73	109	40	96	7	78
72	109	39	96	6	77
71	108	38	95	5	75
70	108	37	95	4	74
69	107	36	95	3	72
68	107	35	94	2	69
67	107	34	94	1	65

*Source: Dunn & Markwardt, 1970

Examples of using the formula for the determination of a 50% Severe Discrepancy Level

$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{I.Q.}{100} \times (C.A. - 5.5)\right]$$

Student A $\quad I.Q. = 110 \qquad C.A. = 8.5$

$$S.D.L = 0.5\left[\frac{110}{100} \times (8.5 - 5.5)\right]$$
$$S.D.L = 0.5\left[\frac{110}{100} \times 3\right]$$
$$S.D.L = 0.5\left[1.1 \times 3\right]$$
$$S.D.L = 0.5 \times 3.3$$
$$S.D.L = 1.65$$

The 50% level for this 3rd grade student is 1.65. In order to manifest a Severe Discrepancy the student's achievement would have to be at a 1.65 grade level or below in one or more of the 7 areas.

Student B $\quad I.Q. = 85 \qquad C.A. = 8.5$

$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{85}{100} \times (8.5 - 5.5)\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{85}{100} \times 3\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[.85 \times 3\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5 \times 2.55$$
$$S.D.L. = 1.275$$

The 50% level for this 3rd grade student is 1.275. In order to manifest a Severe Discrepancy the student's achievement would have to be at a 1.275 grade level or below in one or more of the seven areas.

Student C $\quad I.Q. = 135 \qquad C.A = 8.5$

$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{135}{100} \times (8.5 - 5.5)\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{135}{100} \times 3\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[1.35 \times 3\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5 \times 4.05$$
$$S.D.L. = 2.025$$

The 50% level for this 3rd grade student is 2.025. In order to manifest a Severe Discrepancy the student's achievement would have to be at a 2.025 grade level or below in one or more of the seven areas.

Student D I.Q. = 110 C.A. = 16.0

$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{110}{100} \times (16.0 - 5.5)\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{110}{100} \times 10.5\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[1.1 \times 10.5\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5 \times 11.55$$
$$S.D.L. = 5.8$$

The 50% level for this 10th grade student is 5.8. In order to manifest a Severe Discrepancy the student's achievement would have to be at a 5.8 grade level or below in one or more of the seven areas.

Student E I.Q. = 85 C.A. = 16.0

$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{85}{100} \times (16.0 - 5.5)\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{85}{100} \times 10.5\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[.85 \times 10.5\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5 \times 8.925$$
$$S.D.L. = 4.5$$

The 50% level for this 10th grade student is 4.5. In order to manifest a Severe Discrepancy the student's achievement would have to be at a 4.5 grade level or below in one or more of the seven areas.

Student F I.Q. = 135 C.A. = 16.0

$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{135}{100} \times (16.0 - 5.5)\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[\frac{135}{100} \times 10.5\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5\left[1.35 \times 10.5\right]$$
$$S.D.L. = 0.5 \times 14.175$$
$$S.D.L. = 7.0$$

The 50% level for this 10th grade student is 7.0. In order to manifest a Severe Discrepancy the student's achievement would have to be at a 7.0 grade level or below in one or more of the seven areas.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS SCHOOLS

SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
BLOOMFIELD HILLS SCHOOL DISTRICT

NAME _____

GRADE _____ CLASSROOM TEACHER _____

GENERAL EDUCATION INTERVENTIONS

DATE	AREA OF INTERVENTION	LEARNING ALTERNATIVES	DURATION	RESULTS

CSZ/jb 11-80
SPE 215 41

BLOOMFIELD HILLS SCHOOLS

SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

MULTIDISCIPLINARY EVALUATION TEAM SUMMARY REPORT
LEARNING DISABILITIES

STUDENT NAME _____ AGE _____ DATE _____

The following areas have been assessed and considered by the multidisciplinary evaluation team and have formed the basis for the determination of the student's eligibility as learning disabled. Individual reports are attached.

I. ABILITY LEVEL

Individual I.Q.: Verbal _____ Performance _____ Full Scale _____

Check which data was reviewed for additional information:

_____ Group I.Q.
_____ Developmental Social/Education History
_____ Observation (Required)
_____ Adaptive Behavior
_____ Specialized Ability
_____ Psychological Extras
_____ Inter/Intra Test Analysis

II. ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

	Option 1 Standard Score	Option 2 Grade Level	Estimated Score Used (See Sec. III, Pages 9-13)
A. Oral Expression	_____	_____	_____
B. Listening Comprehension	_____	_____	_____
C. Basic Reading Skills	_____	_____	_____
D. Reading Comprehension	_____	_____	_____
E. Mathematical Calculation	_____	_____	_____
F. Mathematical Reasoning	_____	_____	_____
G. Written Expression	_____	_____	_____

III. Is there evidence of SEVERE DISCREPANCY? Yes _____ No _____

List specific achievement areas: _____

IV. EXCLUSIONARY CLAUSE

Is there any evidence that severe discrepancy may be primarily due to:

A. Visual, hearing, or motor handicap ___Yes ___No
B. Mental Retardation ___Yes ___No
C. Emotional Impairment ___Yes ___No
D. Environmental, Cultural or Economic Disadvantage ___Yes ___No

	YES	NO
V. Has the student been provided with APPROPRIATE EDUCATIONAL ALTERNATIVES:	___	___
Have the alternatives been documented and included in this report?	___	___
Are special education services now required for this student?	___	___

VI. Based on the above data, this student is: ____recommended for certification as L.D.
____not recommended for certification as L.D.

VII. Educationally relevant medical findings: Yes ____ No ____ (Reports attached)

COMMENTS: _____

I agree with the conclusions of this report:

Name and Title		Name and Title	
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____		_____	
_____		_____ I.E.P.C. Representative	

I do not agree with the conclusions of this report and have submitted a written statement presenting my conclusions.

Name and Title	Name and Title
_____	_____

CSZ 10/80

SPE - 220a

Copies to: WHITE: Student File CANARY: Parent PINK: _____

OUTLINE OF IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES

Step	
1	Informal discussion between special education teacher and regular classroom teacher regarding a student that appears to be having problems in the classroom.
2	Regular teacher is instructed to compile data, keep an anecdotal record and document alternatives that have been attempted in general education.
3	B.I.T. discusses student by reviewing data presented by regular and special education teacher. B.I.T. could recommend additional alternatives to be tried in general education and/or provide some screening tests and doing some informal observations to assist the teacher in planning.
4 See R.340.1721 Rule 21	Regular teacher returns to B.I.T. to report on interventions. B.I.T. recommends that a special education referral be initiated.
	-Case coordinator assigned -Review areas to be assessed -Begin referral procedures* (See Special Education Delivery of Service Manual-Bloomfield Hills Schools)
See R.340.1721a Rule 21 a(2)	-Identify complete multidisciplinary team -Document procedures once parents have been informed and have signed referral.

* Within 10 days of receipt of referral and prior to any formal evaluation designed to determine eligibility for special education programs and services the public education agency must notify the parents.

The time from referral or from receipt of parental consent to an initial evaluation to the completion of the individualized educational program or the determination of ineligibility shall not exceed 30 school days. This timeline may be extended if agreed to by the parent and public agency.

OUTLINE OF IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES
(con't)

Step

5 Referral process for L.D. begins. At a minimum the assessment of ability and any of the seven areas of achievement in which there is a suspected deficit must be done.

6 Each member of the multidisciplinary team will prepare a written report of their assessment results that will be shared with the entire multidisciplinary team and the parents.

7 Multidisciplinary team meets to review findings and to fill in part I-V of the Checklist Summary. Documentation will be done as to whether a severe discrepancy exists and whether or not the exclusionary clause applies. Team will make a recommendation of eligibility.

8 Multidisciplinary Team will identify which team member will present the team report to parents at the I.E.P.C.

9 The I.E.P.C. will meet to determine:

a. If the student is learning disabled.
b. What the goals and objectives for the student will be.
c. What services and programs are needed.

The I.E.P.C. will at a minimum include:

a. a representative of the public agency other than the child's teacher qualified to provide or supervise the provision of, special education.

b. the student's teacher or a teacher appropriate for the student's age and ability if the student is not previously enrolled by the public agency.

c. member of the M.E.T.

10 Administrative approval of eligibility, program and service decisions is given and placement is determined.

11 Parental approval is given.

12 Special Education programs and services begin.

IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

LEARNING DISABILITY STANDARDS
PILOT DOCUMENT

1980 - 81

Carmen S. Zeigler
Supervisor of Special Education

Joann C. Brooks
Teacher-Consultant

Jean Rokas
Teacher-Consultant L.R.C.

Arlene Robertson
Psychologist

BLOOMFIELD HILLS SCHOOLS
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48013

Time	Activity	Who Responsible	Who Involved	Resources and Materials used
Summer 1980	Adopt Learning Disability Standards for use in the local school district	Implementation Team -Resource Room teacher - Psychologist - Teacher Consultant - Supervisor of Special Ed.		
	ACTIVITIES TO DEVELOP AWARENESS			
Fall 1980	Present Standards to Central administration for approval	Supervisor of Special Ed.	Deputy Superintendent	Copy of document, Proposed plans for implementation
Nov. 21, 1980-2hrs.	Introduction of Standards to Special Education staff	Implementation Team	Resource Center teachers	Copies of document, Feedback sheets
Dec. 3, 1980-2hrs.	Introduction of Standards to Building administrators	Implementation Team	Building Principals, Elementary and Secondary	Breakfast meeting, Copies of document distributed
Dec. 5, 1980-2hrs.	Introduction of Standards to support personnel	Implementation Team	Psychologists, Social workers, Speech & language, Work study co-ordinator	Copies of document, Feedback sheets
	ACTIVITIES TO DEVELOP KNOWLEDGE			
Dec. 5, 1980-½ day	Procedures for identifying existence of a severe discrepancy Introduction of a format for Report writing	Implementation Team	Resource Room teachers	Salvia & Ysseldyke, Assessment in Special and Remedial Education (1 book per building), Use of examples to compare scores, Sample formats for reports Feedback sheets,
Jan. 16, 1981-2hrs.	Present specific areas of Learning Disability Standards for clarification: Ability Achievement Severe Discrepancy Exclusionary Clause	Implementation Team	Speech & language, Social Workers, Psychologists	Learning Disability Document, Checklist

Time	Activity	Who Responsible	Who Involved	Resources and Materials used
Feb. 6, 1981-½day	Assessment of Achievement Areas Discussion and elaboration of 7 areas of achievement Discussion and review of methods and instruments for evaluation	Implementation Team	Secondary L.R.C. Teachers	Handouts of 7 areas of achievement, Articles concerning assessment, Reviews in the literature on specific instruments for evaluation
	ACTIVITIES TO DEVELOP SKILLS			
Feb. 24, 1981 full day	Assessment of achievement areas Introduction of Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery, Part I and Part II - Administration & scoring Review of Evaluation procedures for the Learning Disabled document.	Implementation Team	Elementary L.R.C. Teachers, Psychologists	Handouts on 7 areas of achievement, Articles and reviews on instruments, Woodcock-Johnson test Batteries and Protocols, Handouts on subtests of Woodcock-Johnson, MET checklists, Request that each teacher do 3 practice protocols before using the Battery, Feedback sheet
Feb. 27, 1981-½day	Introduction of Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery, Part I and Part II - Administration & Scoring Review of Evaluation procedures for Learning Disabled document	Implementation Team	Secondary L.R.C. Teachers, Psychologists	Woodcock-Johnson test Batteries and Protocols, Handouts on subtests of Woodcock-Johnson, MET Checklists, Request each teacher do 3 practice protocols before using Battery, Feedback sheet
Mar. 6, 1981-½day	Review and discussion of alternative grading procedure Discussion of procedures & approaches for development and implementation of appropriate General Education alternatives for students suspected of being Learning Disabled Documentation of need for Special Education services	Implementation Team	Secondary L.R.C. Teachers, Work Study Co-ordinators	Case studies for alternative grading procedures, Case studies for implementation of appropriate General Ed. alternatives, Form for documentation of General Ed. alternatives.

Time	Activity	Who Responsible	Who Involved	Resources and Materials used
Mar. 27, 1981-½day	Review of additional test instruments In depth review and discussion of Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery	Implementation Team Gary Hessler, outside consultant	Special Ed. teachers, Psychologists	Test of written language, Test of adolescent language, Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Batteries, Handouts from Mr. Hessler
Apr. 10, 1981-½day	Review of exclusionary clauses Continuation of Woodcock-Johnson Workshop	Social Worker, Gary Hessler	Special Ed. teachers, Psychologists	MET checklists- Woodcock-Johnson Battery, Handouts from Mr. Hessler
May 8, 1981-½day	Review of activities during previous school year 3rd year evaluation procedures Discussion of future activities Discussion of Documentation, Record keeping, and Report writing	Implementation Team	All Special Education Teachers	MET Reports, MET Summary Sheets, Feedback sheets

In addition to these formal activities many hours have been spent with individuals and teams in the district on an informal basis. Our purpose was to provide hands-on training in the use of identification procedures and to be available to handle questions and concerns as they arose. In addition, we felt it was necessary to provide immediate feedback to teachers and to foster an atmosphere of openess and a feeling of shared responsibility.